

B. REMARKS

Claims 1-55 are pending in the application. The examiner has rejected claims 1-9 and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chen, U.S. Patent No. 5,226,723. The examiner has rejected claims 29-33 and 38-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Great Britain Patent No. 1 585 392 (“GB ‘392”). The examiner has rejected claims 10-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Telefonbau, German Publication No. 1 099 403. The examiner has rejected claims 23-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Caldwell, U.S. Patent No. 5,594,222. The examiner has rejected claims 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB ‘392 in view of Chen. The examiner has rejected claims 51-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB ‘392 in view of Caldwell. The examiner has objected to claims 2-28 and 30-55 based on matters of form. Applicants hereby amend claims 1, 15, 21-22, 29, 43-44, and 49-50.

1. The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Have Been Overcome.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

An integrated low profile display, comprising:

a substrate having a first surface and a second surface;

said substrate defining at least one penetration extending through said substrate from said first surface to said second surface;

each said penetration having a side wall, an entrance opening defined by said first surface, and an exit opening defined by said second surface; and

at least one light emitting device;

each said light emitting device mounted to said first surface of said substrate proximate the entrance opening of a corresponding penetration and adapted to selectively admit light to said penetration via said entrance opening; and

each said light emitting device being electrically connected to a corresponding electrical conductor disposed on said substrate.

Applicants respectfully submit that Chen does not disclose the foregoing combination of elements. Importantly, Chen does not disclose “a substrate defining at least one penetration” and “at least one light emitting device . . . mounted to said first surface of said substrate proximate the entrance opening of a corresponding penetration . . . each said light emitting device being electrically coupled to a corresponding electrical conductor disposed on said substrate.” Instead, Chen discloses a plurality of light emitting diodes (3) mounted to a printed circuit board (1) and a separate reflector unit (2) mounted to the printed circuit board. Reflector unit (2) has a first plurality of penetrations (21), each of which corresponds to a respective light emitting diode (3) and through which a corresponding bonding wire (31) is routed, and a second plurality of penetrations 22 through which such corresponding bonding wire (31) is further routed. Printed circuit board (1) and reflector unit (2) must be prepared with great precision so that light emitting diodes (3) properly align with corresponding penetrations (21) when printed circuit board (1) and reflector (3) are later joined together. The integrated low profile display recited in Applicants’ claim 1 overcomes this distinct disadvantage of the prior art.

Claim 29, as amended, recites a substrate defining at least one cavity having an entrance opening and a closed end, said cavity having a substantially opaque side wall. Applicants respectfully submit that GB ‘392 does not disclose a substrate defining a cavity having a substantially opaque side wall. Indeed, the substrate disclosed in GB ‘392 is transparent and the sidewalls of the cavities defined thereby are transparent as well. As such, light emitted by a light source within a cavity defined by the substrate disclosed in GB ‘392 can travel transversely within the substrate. *See, i.e.,* GB ‘392 at p. 2, ll. 66-69.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 29 are distinguishable over the cited prior art. Because claims 2-28 and 30-55 depend from claims 1 and 29, respectively, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are distinguishable over the prior art, as well.

2. The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Are Moot.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of dependent claims 10-16, 23-28, 34-37, and 51-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are moot because each of these claims depends from an allowable base claim.

3. The Objections to the Claims Have Been Overcome.

Applicants respectfully submit that the addition of the term “apparatus” to amended claims 1 and 29 overcomes the examiner’s consistency-based objections to claims 2-28 and 30-55.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claims 15 and 43 overcome the examiner’s antecedent basis objections to these claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark P. Vrla
Registration No. 43,973

Dated: July 21, 2005

JENNER & BLOCK LLP
One IBM Plaza
Chicago, IL 60611
Ph: (312) 923-2657
fax: (312) 840-7657